

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

LISANDRO QUINTANILLA,

Plaintiff,
VS.

GOLDEN ENTERTAINMENT, *et al.*,

Defendants.

Case No.: 2:22-cv-02117-GMN-NJK

ORDER

Pending before the Court is the Report and Recommendation (“R&R”), (ECF No. 3), of United States Magistrate Judge Nancy J. Koppe, which recommends dismissing the case without prejudice. Also pending before the Court is the Motion/Application for Leave to Proceed *in forma pauperis*, (ECF No. 1), filed by Plaintiff Lisandro Quintanilla.

A party may file specific written objections to the findings and recommendations of a United States Magistrate Judge made pursuant to Local Rule IB 1-4. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B); D. Nev. R. IB 3-2. Upon the filing of such objections, the Court must make a *de novo* determination of those portions to which objections are made if the Magistrate Judge’s findings and recommendations concern matters that may not be finally determined by a magistrate judge. D. Nev. L. R. IB 3-2(b). The Court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the Magistrate Judge. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); D. Nev. L. R. IB 3-2(b). Where a party fails to object, however, the Court is not required to conduct “any review at all . . . of any issue that is not the subject of an objection.” *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 149 (1985) (citing 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)); *see also United States v. Reyna-Tapia*, 328 F.3d 1114, 1122 (9th Cir. 2003).

Here, Plaintiff filed a Response to the R&R, (ECF No. 4). But Plaintiff's Response does not address the reasoning of the R&R. Rather, Plaintiff's Response re-states the facts alleged in

1 the Complaint. (*Compare* Resp. to R&R, ECF No. 4, *with* Compl., ECF No. 1-1). Thus, the
2 Court need not conduct review of the R&R.

3 Moreover, even if the Court could liberally construe *pro se* Plaintiff's Response as a
4 proper objection to the R&R, the Court would nonetheless accept the R&R in full. On January
5 1, 2023, Magistrate Judge Koppe entered an Order to Show Cause instructing Plaintiff to
6 demonstrate the basis for federal jurisdiction of this matter in writing no later than January 24,
7 2023. (OSC, ECF No. 2). Plaintiff did not comply with the Magistrate Judge's Order. Having
8 reviewed the Complaint, the Court agrees with the Magistrate Judge's recommendation that the
9 Complaint be dismissed because Plaintiff has not provided a basis for the Court to exercise
10 jurisdiction. Accordingly,

11 **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that the Report and Recommendation, (ECF No. 3), is
12 **ACCEPTED and ADOPTED** in full.

13 **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that the Motion/Application for Leave to Proceed *in*
14 *forma pauperis*, (ECF No. 1), is **DENIED as moot**.

15 **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that the case is **DISMISSED** without prejudice to its
16 refiling in an appropriate venue.

17 **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that the Clerk of Court is instructed to close the case.

18 Dated this 13 day of July, 2023.



19
20
21 Gloria M. Navarro, District Judge
22
23 United States District Court
24
25